

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment *shall* include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description *shall* include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: • This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Jurisdiction: **PHILLIPS COUNTY, MONTANA**

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction: Phillips County	Title of Plan: Phillips County PDM Plan	Date of Plan: August 2005
Local Point of Contact: Scott Moran	Address: Phillips County Courthouse P.O. Box 360 314 S. 2 nd Ave. W. Malta, MT 59538-0360	
Title: Phillips County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator		
Agency: Phillips County		
Phone Number: 406-654-2350	E-Mail: des@phillipscounty.gov	

State Reviewer: Kent Atwood	Title: SHMO	Date: May 15, 2006
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Wade Nofziger	Title: Mitigation Specialist	Date: May 26, 2006
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	May 17, 2006	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXX	
Date Approved	August 1, 2006	

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Phillips County (Good Standing, mapped 5/19/87)	X			
2. Town of Dodson (Good Standing, mapped 6/17/86)	X			
3. Town of Malta (Good Standing, mapped 5/19/87)	X			
4. Town of Saco (NSFHA)			X	

* Notes: Y = Participating N = Not Participating N/A = Not Mapped

Jurisdiction: **PHILLIPS COUNTY, MONTANA****LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY**

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)	NOT MET	MET
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) OR		N/A
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) AND		X
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		X
Planning Process	N	S
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		X
Risk Assessment	N	S
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		X
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		X
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		X
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	X	
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		X

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)
 Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)
 Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)
 Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)
 Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)
 Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X

Additional State Requirements*

Insert State Requirement
 Insert State Requirement
 Insert State Requirement

N	S

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

XXXX

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer's Comments

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?	N/A			
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?	N/A			
SUMMARY SCORE				N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Page 2	The jurisdictions represented in the plan are Phillips County, and the Towns of Dodson, Malta, and Saco.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Appendix A	All of the jurisdictions adopted the plan. These jurisdictions have also adopted the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).		X
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Appendix A	Copies of resolutions for each jurisdiction are attached provided in the plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Pages 7-8 Appendix B	The plan provides extensive detail on who participated and the process involved.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): *[The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Pages 7-8	The planning process describes who participated, the stakeholder and public meetings, and the plan review process.		X
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Page 7-8 Appendix B	The process involved the senior leadership of the county and towns, as well as local staff, plus state and federal agencies. Appendix B provides the details of newspaper notices and sign-in sheets. The process was well documented.		X
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Page 7 Appendix B	Four public meetings were conducted during initial plan development. Information was provided through newspapers, radio station and public notices sent to officials.		X
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Page 7 Appendix B	The invitations for participation went outside the county, to other counties, plus state and federal agencies. Several outside agencies attended the meetings.		X
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Pages 57-58	The plan is a coordinated effort with the Community Wildfire Preparedness Plan, and incorporated information from many studies and reports.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<p>A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction?</p> <p>If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.</p> <p>Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.</p>	<p>Pages 9-32 CWPP</p>	<p>16 hazards are identified, and broken into Natural Hazards and Human-Caused and Technological Hazards. The major natural hazards discussed were floods, winter storms, wildfire, windstorms, tornadoes, hailstorms, drought and earthquakes. Several human-caused and technological hazards were also discussed. Each hazard profile provides a description of the hazard potentially impacting the county. The plan includes information for all identified hazards and in most cases, the data used is more extensive than that found from readily available on-line resources. For more information refer to SHELDUS (www.sheldus.org). A Flood Insurance Study is available for Phillips County, including incorporated towns. Refer http://msc.fema.gov/ for more information.</p> <p>The plan indicates on page 29 that there are a total of 238 dams and six are high hazard. The National Inventory of Dams (NID) appears to indicate that there are 213 dams in Phillips County and five of them are high hazard dams. Therefore the plan includes data that appears to be more extensive than readily available sources. The National Dam Safety Act requires that an emergency action plan (EAP) be completed for high hazard dams and the NID indicates that all high hazard dams have an EAP. Please see http://crunch.tec.army.mil/nid/webpages/nid.cfm (introduction and download dam data) for National Dam Inventory information.</p> <p>Online EPA data suggests that there are no reported toxic release inventory sites in Phillip County. Please see http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer/ for more information.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 9-32 CWPP	Each hazard profile includes a section on Location and Extent of Previous Flood Events, which identifies the location of past occurrences. The CWPP goes into even further detail of location affected, discussing all incorporated and non-incorporated towns within Phillips County. In addition, the plan included excellent maps within section 4, which helps to identify the locations at risk Recommended Revisions: It would be helpful to include maps of all applicable hazards depicting where in the county hazards have or are likely to occur, noting those areas most severely affected by each hazard.		X
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 9-32 CWPP	The magnitude of past events is highlighted in the hazard profiles and structure loss and associated costs are included when applicable. Recommended Revisions: It may be helpful to develop a table that lists location of hazard, date, time, magnitude, death, injuries, property damage and crop damage.		X
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 9-32 CWPP	The planners used newspaper reports, NWS, and various other sources to give the best possible historical perspective. Recommendation: Overcoming data limitations should be considered as a work element when they develop the five year update.		X
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 37-41 CWPP	The plan shows historical period of record and frequency of occurrence for the major natural hazards. The Risk Calculations are very detailed, and a good summary. Recommendation for the five year update. The categories need to be defined i.e. what are "Societal Risk" and "Societal Exposure". More simplistic terms would be helpful.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Pages 37-45	Each hazard profile includes a discussion on the jurisdictions overall vulnerability and provides the impacts on the communities by discussing past occurrences.		X
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Pages 37-45	The hazard profiles identify past events related to location and costs when applicable. In addition, the tables on page 44-45 include tables that discuss hazard, frequency, magnitude, building exposure, societal exposure, building risk, societal risk and critical facilities. The CWPP includes information on the impacts from wildfire on individual communities, including: land use, structures, and vulnerable populations.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pages 33-34 Appendix E	<p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>Appendix E includes a list of critical facilities, which are separated by jurisdiction, although the plan does not include the type of buildings, i.e. residential, commercial etc., and there is no connection to the hazard areas. The CWPP does an excellent job of including types and values of building stock and agricultural land. The CWPP also includes the number of critical facilities within the fire hazard area.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update:</p> <p>For each hazard, identify the type and number of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area.</p> <p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>	X	

<p>B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?</p>	<p>Pages 35-36</p>	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing. No mention of future buildings is included in the plan.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update: For each hazard identify the type and number of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions: Identify the types of buildings (e.g., residential, commercial, institutional, recreational, industrial, and municipal buildings), infrastructure (e.g., roadways, bridges, utilities, and communications systems), and critical facilities (e.g., shelters, hospitals, police, and fire stations). Information on proposed buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities, including planned and approved development, may be based on information in the comprehensive or land use plan and zoning maps.</p>	<p>X</p>	
<p>SUMMARY SCORE</p>			<p>X</p>	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?	Pages 41-45 Appendix E	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan includes four tables which lists the jurisdiction, hazard, building \$ exposure, and building \$ risk although they are lump sums and it is not possible to determine the specific vulnerable structures that were used to derive these numbers.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update: Include dollar amounts for each identified vulnerable structure. When data permits include potential content loss for each structure.</p>	X	
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?	Pages 33 & 41	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan includes the methodology used to prepare the estimates. The estimates were derived from building stock values which is based on the building stock data available from the FEMA HAZUS software.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	Pages 35-36	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>Land Use and development trends are generally discussed in the plan. Population reduction is discussed on page 2, although it may be helpful to have more detailed projections in relation to</p>	X	

		<p>identified hazard areas. The plan also states that local officials have indicated that there is no future building proposed that would be located in identified hazard areas, although several of the identified hazards are county wide.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update:</p> <p>Please provide a discussion on land use and potential future projects in relation to hazard areas, so mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.</p>		
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Pages 39-45	<p>The plan does include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction under the hazard impact area section. Maps are also included that depict the flooding, transportation, and cumulative hazards.</p> <p>The CWPP includes Ignition profile, which identifies jurisdictions most at risk to fire hazards.</p> <p>Recommended Revision for the five year update:</p> <p>Prepare a summary of the various jurisdictions that describe only the risks that vary among identified jurisdictions.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): *The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): *[The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	Page 46 CWPP page 56	Eight goals are listed in the PDM and CWPP, three of which are primarily natural hazard related.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Pages 46-47	Although most of the activities are Preparedness and Response issues, the plan lists a range of necessary activities.		X
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 46-47	Marginally met. While many of the measures are Preparedness and Response issues, they can have an impact on any new construction that could possibly occur. There are a few projects that may have a marginal effect on new buildings, such as providing training to farmers and ranchers. Recommended Revision for the five year update: The plan would be enhanced if projects were included that were directly related to mitigation, such as implementing more strict building codes.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 46-47	The listed actions provide a general direction for existing buildings and structures. Firewise efforts are addressed.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Pages 47-48 Tables 4.2 & 4.3	The plan provides a very nicely done matrix that lays out the priorities.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Page 48 Tables 4.2, 4.3	The plan, via the matrix, identifies actions, resources, funding, and timeframes.		X
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	Pages 47-48 Tables 4.2 CWPP	The planners did an excellent job in working the cost-benefit review.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): *For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Pages 46-47 Tables 4.2, 4.3	All of the jurisdictions have at least one project identified for them.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): *[The plan maintenance process shall include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	Page 55	The county DES Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring the plan and keeping the county commissioners informed of progress on the projects.		X
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	Page 55	In addition to the five year update, the plan will be reviewed every two years, or as necessary.		X
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	Page 55	The county DES Coordinator will be responsible for updating the plan every five years and will coordinate any changes.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): *[The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Pages 55-56	Local officials will work with the County departments to ensure hazard mitigation projects are consistent with planning goals and integrate them, where appropriate. The County is developing a Comprehensive Growth Policy, which can be integrated into the plan.		X
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Pages 55-56	The County has determined that a major element of this requirement is associated with the enforcement of building codes, to include working with state agencies on this enforcement.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Page 56	The DES Coordinator will publicize the meetings and maintain public involvement through newspapers and radio. Also, a copy of the plan will be kept at the Public Library for review.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X